UTF 424, hep-th-9811039

Consistent, covariant and multiplicative anomalies

Guido Cognola* and Sergio Zerbini†
Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trento
and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare
Gruppo Collegato di Trento, Italia
(January 1998)

arXiv:hep-th/9811039v2 26 Apr 1999

Abstract

It is shown that the multiplicative anomaly in the vector-axial-vector model, which apparently has nothing to do with the breaking of classical current symmetries, nevertheless is strictly related to the well known consistent and covariant anomalies.

11.10.-z,11.30.-j

Typeset using REVTEX

*cognola@science.unitn.it

†zerbini@science.unitn.it

Anomalies, as quantum breaking of classical symmetries, have been studied by physicists for a long time in the past, in the framework of a perturbative analysis based on Feynman diagrams [1–3] and also in the context of path-integral formalism [4–7].

Very recently, another kind of anomaly, the so called "multiplicative anomaly", has appeared in the physical literature [8–14]. The name, which is due mathematicians [15–17], may create some confusion between physicists, since such an anomaly has nothing to do (at least in a direct manner) with the breaking of classical symmetries. It can be thought of as a "measure" of the lacking of the commutative property of the determinant of the product involving two differential operators regularised by means of ζ-function.

Within the one-loop approximation, one meets products of operators in several physical systems, namely when one is dealing with matrix valued differential operators and assumes constant background fields. However, it is not easy to find situations in which the multiplicative anomaly (from now on MA) has a direct physical relevance. In fact, since the MA is a local functional of the geometric data and of the background field, its contribution to the effective action can be usually absorbed by the one-loop renormalisation procedure. Furthermore, since it comes from the evaluation of the one-loop functional determinant, it has a quantum origin, i.e. it is proportional to the Planck constant and, as a result, it is quite easy to show that it does not give contributions to the one loop beta-functions of the theory. However, this is not the case for more complicated systems at finite temperature and non vanishing chemical potential, where there exists the possibility of spontaneous symmetry breaking (see Ref. [18]). At the moment the (possible) physical importance of MA is considered by some authors an open question (see the criticisms in Refs. [12,13,11]).

With regard to this issue, in ref. [19], (see also [20] in connection with lattice anomalies), it has been shown that the non abelian chiral anomaly can be evaluated as a regularised trace of the commutator of pseudo-differential operators. The connection of this elegant and general result with the MA is that the latter is strictly related to the lack of ciclicity of the regularised trace. In particular, one can see more directly why the MA leads to the chiral anomaly. The argument goes as follows [1]. The effective action may be written as

$$W(A) \simeq \ln \det(D_0^+ D(A)) \,, \tag{1}$$

where D_0 is a suitable free Dirac operator and $D(A)$ is the chiral Dirac operator mapping left spinors to right spinors. If one makes a gauge transformation, one has

$$W(A_g) \simeq \ln \det(D_0^+ g^{-1} D(A) g) \,. \tag{2}$$

Thus, the non vanishing of the MA leads to the loss of gauge invariance of the effective action, and this implies the existence of the chiral anomaly. This kind of relevance of the MA has also been noticed in a completely different contest, namely within the non relativistic quantum statistical mechanics [11].

Furthermore, in the present letter we will not be able to show that MA is related to direct observable effects, but nevertheless we will show again that it has an indirect physical

[1] We would like to thank the referee for pointing out this fact

importance, since it relates consistent and covariant current anomalies in a vector-axial-vector model. In this respect, its name is not totally unappropriated.

We recall that the current anomalies of the vector-axial-vector model have been derived for the first time by Bardeen in Ref. [3]. Later, all results have been confirmed and generalized to curved manifold by other authors [21–27].

In particular, the local polynomials, which one has to add to the currents in order to pass from the consistent anomaly to the covariant one, have been explicitly written down [27].

We introduce now the definition of MA. Given a positive elliptic operator D of positive order acting on the space of smooth sections of a vector bundle over d-dimensional manifold without boundary, one defines related functional determinant by means of the associated ζ-function. In the case of positive elliptic operators

$$\zeta(s|D) = \mathrm{Tr}\, D^{-s}\,, \qquad\qquad \det{}_\zeta D = \exp\left(-\zeta'(0|D)\right)\,. \tag{3}$$

However, for first order partial operators, like the Dirac ones, one starts again from

$$\zeta(s|D) = \sum_{\lambda_n} \lambda_n^{-s} \tag{4}$$

which converges if $\mathrm{Re}\, s > d$, and the sum is over the whole spectrum, and one has to assume the existence of a spectral cut, namely $L_\theta = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \theta_1 < \mathrm{Arg}\,\lambda < \theta_2\, \mathrm{Spec}\, D \cup L_\theta = \emptyset\}$. Then it follows that there exists the analytical continuation at $s = 0$ of the above series and again one can define [17]

$$\det{}_\zeta D = \exp\left(-\zeta'(0|D)\right)\,. \tag{5}$$

For massless chiral Dirac operators in even-dimensional manifold the spectral asymmetry is vanishing and one has

$$\ln\det D = -\frac{1}{2}\zeta'(0|D^2) \pm \frac{i\pi}{2}\zeta(0|D^2)\,, \tag{6}$$

where the sign ambiguity depends on the choice of the cut of the logarithm for the negative part of the spectrum. This is a rigorous definition of functional determinant, well known and well used in quantum field theory [28–30]. Unfortunately, it does not have all properties of determinant of matrices. If fact, for two operators, in general one has

$$\zeta'(0|D_1 D_2) \neq \zeta'(0|D_1) + \zeta'(0|D_2) \tag{7}$$

and this means that (by det we always mean $\det_\zeta$)

$$\ln\det(D_1 D_2) = \ln\det D_1 + \ln\det D_2 + a(D_1, D_2)\,, \tag{8}$$

$a(D_1, D_2)$ being the MA. This is strictly related to the definition of determinant through ζ-function, but of course other definitions would have other pathologies.

In simple cases, the multiplicative anomaly can be directly computed by definition above, but there is also a general formula which directly follows from Wodzicki theory [17,14]. If

$D_1 = D$ and $D_2 = D + M$ are two first-order, non-commuting, differential operators in a (Euclidean) manifold without boundary, then the multiplicative anomaly can be written in the form [14]

$$a(D_1, D_2) = \frac{1}{4}\,\mathrm{res}\,\left\{\ln^2(D_1 D_2^{-1})\right\} + \frac{1}{6}\,\mathrm{res}\,\left\{[\ln(D_1 D_2^{-1})\ln D_2]^2 - \ln^2(D_1 D_2^{-1})\ln^2 D_2\right\}\,, \tag{9}$$

where we have omitted terms which do not contribute to the MA in four (or less) dimensions and res(Q) is the non-commutative (or Wodzicki) residue, which can be defined for any classical pseudo-differential operator Q of order q by the formula [16]

$$\mathrm{res}\,(Q) = b\,\mathrm{Res}\,\mathrm{Tr}(QB^{-z})|_{z=0}\,, \tag{10}$$

B being an arbitrary elliptic operator of order $b > q$ and Res the usual Cauchy residue. In turns, for small z, one has

$$\mathrm{Tr}(QB^{-z}) = \frac{\mathrm{res}\,(Q)}{bz} + c(Q) + O(z)\,, \tag{11}$$

with $c(Q)$ a non-trivial term, which depends on Q.

The formula for the MA above notably simplifies in the case of commuting operators. In particular, in two dimensions one has

$$a(D, D + M) = \frac{1}{8\pi}\int \mathrm{tr}\,M^2\,d^2x\,, \tag{12}$$

where tr is the trace on internal or Dirac matrices. It has to be noted that in the case of non commuting operators too, Eq. (12) (for dimensional reasons) is nevertheless the exact result, but this is true only in two dimensions. In four dimensions (or more), derivative terms are also present.

Now we briefly resume the results concerning the vector-axial-vector model. For details and notations see Refs. [26,27]. One considers a massless Dirac particle with arbitrary internal degrees of freedom in interaction with gauge and an axial gauge potentials.

The model is described by the classical action

$$S = \int\left(\frac{1}{2}i\overline{\psi}\gamma^k\nabla_k\psi - \frac{1}{2}i\nabla_k\overline{\psi}\gamma^k\psi + i\overline{\psi}\gamma^k\gamma^5 A_k\psi\right)\,d^4x\,, \tag{13}$$

where

$$\nabla_k\psi = (\partial_k + V_k)\psi\,, \qquad V_k = -iV_k^a\tau_a\,, \qquad A_k = -iA_k^a\tau_a\,, \tag{14}$$

are the covariant derivative, the gauge and the axial-gauge potentials respectively. By τ_a we indicate the generators of the gauge group and by γ^k the (Euclidean) Dirac matrices.

The one-loop effective action W is given

$$W = -\ln\det D = \zeta'(0|D)\,, \tag{15}$$

with

$$D = i\gamma^k\nabla_k + i\gamma^k\gamma^5 A_k\,, \qquad\qquad D^\dagger = i\gamma^k\nabla_k - i\gamma^k\gamma^5 A_k\,. \tag{16}$$

Note that we consider the Euclidean section and so $\gamma^k = \gamma^{k\dagger}$ and $D = D^\dagger + 2i\gamma^k\gamma^5 A_k$.

From a classical view point, both the vector and axial-vector currents are conserved, but quantum corrections break the symmetry and the currents acquire anomalous terms. If δ_V and δ_A are the infinitesimal vector and axial-vector transformations, which classically give the conserved currents, that is

$$\delta_V\psi = -\varepsilon\psi\,, \qquad\qquad \delta_V V_k = \partial_k\varepsilon + [V_k,\varepsilon]\,, \qquad\qquad \delta_V A_k = [A_k,\varepsilon]\,, \tag{17}$$

$$\delta_A\psi = -\gamma^5\varepsilon\tau_a\psi\,, \qquad\qquad \delta_A A_k = \partial_k\varepsilon + [V_k,\varepsilon]\,, \qquad\qquad \delta_A V_k = [A_k,\varepsilon]\,, \tag{18}$$

$$\delta_V D = -(D\varepsilon - \varepsilon D)\,, \qquad\qquad \delta_A D = -(D\varepsilon + \varepsilon D)\,, \tag{19}$$

where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon^a(x)\tau_a$ is an infinitesimal matrix (depending on x), then the related currents satisfy the (modified) continuity equations

$$\partial_k J^k + [V_k, J^k] + [A_k,\, {}^5J^k] = \mathcal{A}_a\tau^a\,, \tag{20}$$

$$\partial_k\, {}^5J^k + [V_k,\, {}^5J^k] + [A_k, J^k] = {}^5\mathcal{A}_a\tau^a\,. \tag{21}$$

In the literature, two kinds of anomalies concerning this currents have been well studied. The first one is the so called consistent anomaly, which has been first derived by Bardeen from perturbation theory and can be easily obtained by path integral, by regularizing the one-loop effective action according to the rule

$$W_1 = \frac{1}{2}\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{d}{ds}\,\zeta(s|D^2)\,, \tag{22}$$

with the implicit continuation $A_k \to iA_k$ in order to have a hermitian operator D. The gauge invariance is lost, but the Wess-Zumino consistency conditions are satisfied (see, for example, [21,6]). In this case only the axial symmetry is broken.

Using Eqs. (19) one easily obtains

$$\delta_V\,\mathrm{Tr}\,D^{-2s} = 0\,, \qquad\qquad \delta_A\,\mathrm{Tr}\,D^{-2s} = -2s\,\mathrm{Tr}(D^{-2s}\gamma^5\varepsilon)\,. \tag{23}$$

Since the analytic continuation of $\mathrm{Tr}(D^{-2s}\gamma^5\varepsilon)$ is regular at $s = 0$, for the consistent anomalies we have

$$\mathcal{A}_a^{cons} = \frac{\delta_V}{\delta\varepsilon^a}\,W_1 = 0\,, \tag{24}$$

$${}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cons} = \frac{\delta_A}{\delta\varepsilon^a}\,W_1 = \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\,\mathrm{tr}[\tau_a\gamma^5 a_2(x|D^2)]\,, \tag{25}$$

where $a_2(x|H)$ is the local spectral coefficient relative to the second order operator H. It is understood that in arbitrary even dimensions $2N$, in the latter equation one has to replace $a_2/(4\pi)^2$ with $a_N/(4\pi)^N$.

The second one, which is called "covariant anomaly", can be formally obtained from the "covariant functional"

$$W_2 = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{s\to 0} \frac{d}{ds}\, \zeta(s|D^\dagger D)\,. \tag{26}$$

In this last case, both the currents J^k and ${}^5J^k$ acquire an anomalous "covariant" term, but the Wess-Zumino consistency conditions are not satisfied. This is due to the fact that, in the ζ-function regularisation, one has to work with an arbitrary argument s of ζ and only at the end of the calculation one has to take the limit $s \to 0$. Such a "breaking of the consistency" is strictly related to the operator one has to deal with and to the necessity of workig with regularised quantities. With regard to this, the form of the variation of the operator is crucial.

Now, again using Eqs. (19) and the "intertwining identity"

$$D\, f(D^\dagger D)\, D^\dagger = DD^\dagger\, f(DD^\dagger)\,, \tag{27}$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_V \,\mathrm{Tr}(D^\dagger D)^{-s} &= -2s\,\mathrm{Tr}\left\{\left[(D^\dagger D)^{-s} - (DD^\dagger)^{-s}\right]\varepsilon\right\}\,,\\
\delta_A \,\mathrm{Tr}(D^\dagger D)^{-s} &= -2s\,\mathrm{Tr}\left\{\left[(D^\dagger D)^{-s} + (DD^\dagger)^{-s}\right]\gamma^5\varepsilon\right\}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The traces in the formulae above have regular analytic continuations to $s = 0$ and the first derivative with respect to s at $s = 0$ gives the following formulae for the covariant anomaly:

$$\mathcal{A}_a^{cov} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\tau_a[a_2(x|D^\dagger D) - a_2(x|DD^\dagger)]\}\,, \tag{29}$$

$${}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cov} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\tau_a\gamma^5[a_2(x|D^\dagger D) + a_2(x|DD^\dagger)]\}\,. \tag{30}$$

Explicit expressions for the anomalies have been computed using different methods also in curved space-time with torsion [26,27]). For a non abelian gauge group the difference reads

$$\mathcal{A}_a^{cov} - \mathcal{A}_a^{cons} = \mathcal{A}_a^{cov} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\,\mathrm{tr}[F^*G + G^*F]\,, \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cov} - {}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cons} = \frac{1}{12\pi^2}\,\mathrm{tr}\,\{&G^*G - 8e_{ijrs}A^iA^jA^rA^s\\
&+4[{}^*F_{ij}A^iA^j + A^iA^j{}^*F_{ij} + A^i{}^*F_{ij}A^j]\Big\}\,\tau_a\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where

$$F_{ij} = \partial_i V_j - \partial_j V_i + [V_i, V_j] + [A_i, A_j]\,, \tag{33}$$

$$G_{ij} = \partial_i A_j - \partial_j A_i + [V_i, A_j] - [V_j, A_i]\,, \tag{34}$$

$$ {}^*F^{ij} = e^{ijrs}\, F_{rs}\,, \qquad\qquad G^*G = e^{ijrs} G_{ij} G_{rs}\,. \tag{35} $$

It is possible to pass from the consistent anomaly to the covariant one by adding local polynomials to the currents. Such polynomials $\chi^k = \chi^k_a \tau^a$ and ${}^5\chi^k = {}^5\chi^k_a \tau^a$ are chosen to satisfy [27] (for a misprint, in that paper χ^k and ${}^5\chi^k$ are exchanged)

$$ \partial_k \chi^k + [V_k, \chi^k] + [A_k, {}^5\chi^k] = (\mathcal{A}^{cov}_a - \mathcal{A}^{cons}_a)\tau^a\,, \tag{36} $$

$$ \partial_k {}^5\chi^k + [V_k, {}^5\chi^k] + [A_k, \chi^k] = ({}^5\mathcal{A}^{cov}_a - {}^5\mathcal{A}^{cons}_a)\tau^a\,. \tag{37} $$

In this way, if J^k and ${}^5J^k$ satisfy continuity equations with the consistent anomalous term then $J^k + \chi^k$ and ${}^5J^k + {}^5\chi^k$ satisfy continuity equations with the covariant anomalous term. The polynomials one has to add to the currents are chosen "ad hoc" in order to satisfy the previous conditions. Here we show that they are related to the corresponding multiplicative anomaly (connections between current terms and the Wodzicki residue have been pointed out also in Ref. [31]).

To this aim, we first observe that

$$ \zeta'(0|D^\dagger D) = \zeta'(0|D^\dagger) + \zeta'(0|D) + \; a(D^\dagger, D)\,. \tag{38} $$

Moreover, since D and $D^\dagger$ only differs in the sign of A_k, we also have

$$ \delta_V \zeta'(0|D^\dagger) = -\delta_V \zeta'(0|D) = 0\,, \tag{39} $$

$$ \delta_A \zeta'(0|D^\dagger) = \delta_A \zeta'(0|D) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_A \zeta'(0|D^2) \tag{40} $$

and finally, using Eqs. (38-40) and remembering the definitions of the anomalies, we obtain the result

$$ (\mathcal{A}^{cov}_a - \mathcal{A}^{cons}_a) = \frac{\delta_V}{2\delta\varepsilon^a}\, a(D^\dagger, D)\,, \tag{41} $$

$$ ({}^5\mathcal{A}^{cov}_a - {}^5\mathcal{A}^{cons}_a) = \frac{\delta_A}{2\delta\varepsilon^a}\, a(D^\dagger, D)\,. \tag{42} $$

The MA is a functional of V_k and A_k, then by performing the variations and comparing the result with Eqs. (36) and (37) we obtain

$$ \chi^k_a = \frac{1}{2}\,\frac{\delta a(D^\dagger, D)}{\delta V^a_k}\,, \qquad\qquad {}^5\chi^k_a = \frac{1}{2}\,\frac{\delta \mathcal{A}(D^\dagger, D)}{\delta A^a_k}\,. \tag{43} $$

In order to check the above relations, we have rigorously proved using ζ-function techniques, one has to evaluate MA by using the more general and complicated formula, Eq. (9). This can be done in principle, but, since one is dealing with non commuting operators, it is not an easy task in general, but in two dimensions, where one has the simple formula, Eq. (12).

Thus, let us consider the simple case of abelian vector-axial vector field in two dimensions. Such a model is described by a classical action similar to the one in Eq. (13), with $\gamma^0 = \sigma_1$, $\gamma^1 = \sigma_2$ and $\gamma^5 = \sigma_3$. Since we are in two dimensions now we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
{}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cov} - {}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cons} &= \frac{1}{4\pi}\,\mathrm{tr}\left\{\gamma^5\left[a_1(x|D^\dagger D) + a_1(x|DD^\dagger) - 2a_1(x|D^2)\right]\right\} \\
&= -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\partial_k A^k\,. \qquad (44)
\end{aligned}
$$

With regard to the MA, since we are in two dimensions, we can use Eq. (12) with $M = 2i\gamma^k\gamma^5 A_k$ and the result reads

$$
a(D^\dagger, D) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int A_k A^k\, d^2x\,, \qquad (45)
$$

from which, the relation

$$
{}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cov} - {}^5\mathcal{A}_a^{cons} = \frac{\delta_A}{2\delta\varepsilon}a(D^\dagger, D) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\partial_k A^k\,. \qquad (46)
$$

easily follows.

In this letter, we have shown that MA in the vector-axial-vector model relates consistent and covariant anomalies and we have also determined, as functional derivatives of MA, the local polynomials which permit to pass from one form of the anomaly to the other one. We have also checked the general results in a simple two dimensional case, where explicit computations can be performed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank L. Vanzo for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Adler. Phys. Rev. **177**, 1426 (1969).

[2] J. Bell and R. Jackiw. Nuovo Cimento **A 60**, 47 (1969).

[3] W.A. Bardeen. Phys. Rev. **184**, 1848 (1969).

[4] D.J. Gross and R. Jackiw. Phys. Rev. **D 6**, 477 (1972).

[5] K. Fujikawa. Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 1560 (1975).

[6] K. Fujikawa. Phys. Lett. **42**, 1195 (1979).

[7] R.E. Gamboa Saravi, M.A. Muschietti, F.A. Schaposnik and J.E. Solomin. Ann. Phys. **157**, 360 (1984).

[8] E. Elizalde, L. Vanzo and S. Zerbini. Commun. Math. Phys. **194**, 613 (1998).

[9] A.A. Bytsenko and F. L. Williams. J. Math. Phys. **38**, 1075 (1998).

[10] A. Filippi, *Inclusion of Chemical Potential for Scalar Fields* hep–ph/9703323, Imperial/TP/96–97/37 (1997).

[11] J. J. McKenzie-Smith and D. J. Toms, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 105001 (1998).

[12] J.S. Dowker, *On the relevance of the multiplicative anomaly.* preprint MUTP/98/4 hep–th/9803200 (1998).

[13] N. Evans, *Regularisation schemes and the multiplicative anomaly* hep–th/9803184 (1998).

[14] E. Elizalde, G. Cognola and S. Zerbini, Nucl. Phys. **B532**, 407 (1998).

[15] M. Wodzicki. *Non-commutative Residue Chapter I.* In *Lecture notes in Mathematics.* Yu.I. Manin, editor, volume 1289, 320. Springer-Verlag, (1987).

[16] C. Kassel. Asterisque **177**, 199 (1989), Sem. Bourbaki.

[17] M. Kontsevich and S. Vishik. *Functional Analysis on the Eve of the 21st Century.* volume 1, 173–197, (1995).

[18] E. Elizalde, A. Filippi, L. Vanzo and S. Zerbini. Phys. Rev. **D57**, 7430 (1998).

[19] E. Langmann and J. Mickelsonn, Lett. Math. Phys. **36**, 45 (1996).

[20] J. Mickelsonn, *Chiral anomalies on lattice* hep-lat/9602030 (1996).

[21] M. Reuter. Phys. Rev. **D 31**, 1374 (1985).

[22] A.P. Balachandran, G. Marmo, V.P. Nair and C.G. Trahern. Phys. Rev. **D 25**, 2713 (1982).

[23] A. Andrianov and L. Bonora. Nucl. Phys. **B233**, 232 (1984).

[24] M.B. Einhorn and D.R.T. Jones. Phys. Rev. **D 29**, 331 (1984).

[25] S.K. Hu and B.L. Young. Phys. Rev. **D 30**, 836 (1984).

[26] G. Cognola and P. Giacconi. Phys. Rev. **D 39**, 2987 (1989).

[27] G. Cognola, P. Giacconi and R. Soldati. J. Math. Phys. **31**, 2699 (1990).

[28] J.S. Dowker and R. Critchley. Phys. Rev. **D 13**, 3224 (1976).

[29] S.W. Hawking. Commun. Math. Phys. **55**, 133 (1977).

[30] A.A. Bytsenko, G. Cognola, L. Vanzo and S. Zerbini. Phys. Rep. **266**, 1 (1996).

[31] J. Mickelsson. *Wodzicki residue and anomalies of current algebras.* In *Proceedings of Integrable models and Strings (Helsinki 1993)*, 123, (1993). hep-th/9404093.